

REMARKS

The foregoing amendment amends independent Claims 15, 22 and 23 to clarify the claimed invention. Claims 1-17 and 19-38 are currently pending in this application, with Claims 1-14 and 24-38 being withdrawn. For the reasons set forth below, Applicants believe that the rejections should be withdrawn and that the claims are in condition for allowance.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 15-17, 22 AND 23 UNDER U.S.C. 102(e)

The Examiner rejected Claims 15-17, 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,266,649 to Linden *et al.* ("Linden"). As discussed below, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The foregoing amendment to Claim 15 clarifies that the advertisement providing server provides the advertisement on behalf of the advertisement sponsor (which is different than the information provider), to a client of the information provider who is accessing the target information specified in advance by the advertisement sponsor, where the advertisement information is provided with the information provided by the information provider and associated with additional information provided by the advertisement sponsor that can be accessed by related users who also accessed the target information. *See e.g.*, Fig. 16, [0194]-[0196]; and Fig. 18, [0205]-[0212]. The Examiner rejected Claim 15 citing the server disclosed by Linden for both the advertising providing server and the information provider. The foregoing amendment clarifies that the advertising sponsor and the information provider are distinct.

The method of Claim 15, further provides for the appropriate advertisement information of the advertisement sponsor to be relayed to the user according to the access log of each user, so that the additional information acquisition count for the advertisement sponsor is increased, even when the advertisement viewing count is the same, because the advertisement information (from the advertisement providing server) is strategically provided to those users who are more likely to be interested in the additional information than others. *See e.g.*, [0197] and [0217].

In contrast, Linden only produces a recommendations list by combining the similar items lists corresponding to the items known to be of interest to user, such as items purchased before. Thus the Linden recommendations list is simply a list of names of similar items. Figs. 1 and 6. Although Linden does briefly mention that the recommendations list could be presented as advertisements for the recommended items (Col. 11, lines 54-56), Linden is only referring to the manner in which the recommendations list is presented by the system to the user. Thus, the recommendations are merely presented to the user as an advertisement containing a list of names of similar items. Linden only discloses providing advertisements of the information provider for the benefit of the information provider.

Moreover, Linden discloses a recommendation service that is a part of the server that also provides items put into the shopping cart by the user. Therefore, the recommendation service disclosed in Linden is actually the recommendation made by the server itself, and thus not a separate and distinct advertisement sponsor, as required by Claim 15.

Linden does not describe using the target information as a trigger for providing the advertisement of the advertisement sponsor. Linden does not disclose providing a sponsored advertisement of the advertisement sponsor to the user of the information provider who is accessing target information which is specified in advance by the same advertisement sponsor and on behalf of the advertisement sponsor, as required by Claim 15. The shopping cart data of Linden does not disclose the target information specified in advance, as claimed by Claim 15, since the shopping cart data is maintained by the same server that manages the access logs. As discussed above, the advertising sponsor and the information provider are distinct, and the target information is specified by the advertisement sponsor.

Consequently, Linden does not disclose an advertisement sponsor that provides the advertisement information to a user who is accessing target information specified in advance by the advertisement sponsor according to user access logs and which is separate and distinct from the information provider. Accordingly, Claim 15 is not anticipated by Linden.

The foregoing amendment amends Claims 22 and 23 in a manner similar to Claim 15. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons discussed above, Claims 22 and 23 are patentable over Linden.

Claims 16 and 17 depend from Claim 15. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons discussed above, Claims 16 and 17 are patentable over Linden.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 19-21 UNDER U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claims 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Linden in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0191742 to Yonezawa et al. ("Yonezawa"). As discussed below, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 19-21 depend from Claim 15. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons discussed above, Claims 19-21 are patentable over Linden in view of Yonezawa.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing is submitted as a complete response to the Office Action identified above. This application should now be in condition for allowance, and the Applicants solicit a notice to that effect. No fees are believed due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 11-0855. If there are any issues that can be addressed via telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the undersigned at 404.685.6799.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brenda O. Holmes/
Reg. No. 40,339

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
1100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2800
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-4530
Telephone: (404) 815-6500
Facsimile: (404) 815-6555
Our Docket: 44471/259522
Date: September 18, 2007